

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action mailed February 5, 2009, claims 1 – 12 were rejected. Applicants point out that claims 13 and 14 were added in the response filed November 11, 2008. However, claims 13 and 14 are not addressed in the current Office action. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks. No claims are amended, added, or canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walczak et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,818,348, hereinafter Walczak). Additionally, claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walczak in view of Meier (EP 0805575, hereinafter Meier). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Walczak and Meier for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

“A method of recognizing whether a transponder designed for communicating with a communication station belongs to one of at least two groups of transponders under which method the communication station designed for communicating with the transponder delivers a request signal to the transponder, which request signal comprises a command data block and a check data block, and under which method, data contained in the request signal is evaluated in the transponder in order to recognize whether the transponder belongs to a group of transponders,

wherein, for each group of transponders, a check data block that is significant for the group of transponders is generated, and

wherein the data that is evaluated for the recognition of whether the transponder belongs to a group of transponders is data from the check data block that is significant for the group of transponders.” (emphasis added)

That is, claim 1 recites that a check data block in a request signal is used to determine if a transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.

Walczak discloses a query frame (600) that has an information sequence block (604) and a check sequence block (606). In particular, Walczak discloses:

“FIG. 6, numeral 600, is a diagram of a preferred embodiment of a query frame in accordance with the present invention. The query frame includes an initialization sequence (602) with a dotting pattern and sync pattern, at least one information sequence (604), and at least one check sequence (606). The first information sequence (604) of the query frame includes a transponder group type and a frame identifier (ID).

The transponder group type identifies the group, classification, or vendor. A typical group type is 16 bits long. The frame identifier differentiates a query from a command. A typical frame identifier for a query frame is a single bit set to 1.” (col. 4, lines 35 – 47) (emphasis added)

That is, Walczak discloses that the information sequence block (604) includes data that is significant for a group of transponders. However, Walczak does not disclose that the check sequence block (606) includes data that is significant for a group of transponders. With respect to the check sequence block (606), Walczak discloses no other purpose except for reliability checking, see for example, col. 3, lines 24 – 37.

Because Walczak does not disclose that the check sequence block (606) includes data that is significant for a group of transponders, Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Walczak.

Claims 2 – 14

Claims 2 – 12 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 – 12 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, each of claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claims 4, 6, 8, and 11 particularly point out that the start values are “group-significant” start values and that each of the different group-significant start values are “assigned to a different group of transponders.”

The limitations of claims 4, 6, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the Office action cites Meier as teaching the limitations of these claims. Applicants assert that Meier does not teach group-significant start values that are each assigned to a different group of transponders as recited in the amended claims. At page 4, lines 36 – 43, Meier teaches that start values of a CRC generator can be programmed. However,

nowhere does Meier teach or suggest that the start values should be programmed as group-significant start values that are each assigned to a different group of transponders as recited in claim 4, 6, 8, and 11. Because Meier does not teach or suggest that the start values of the CRC generator should be group-significant start values that are each assigned to a different group of transponders, Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 4, 6, 8, and 11.

Claims 9 and 12 particularly point out that the start values are “group-significant” start values. The limitations of claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the Office action cites Meier as teaching the limitations of these claims. Applicants assert that Meier does not teach group-significant start values as recited in claims 9 and 12. At page 4, lines 36 – 43, Meier teaches that start values of a CRC generator can be programmed. However, nowhere does Meier teach or suggest that the start values should be programmed as group-significant start values. Because Meier does not teach or suggest that the start values of the CRC generator should be group-significant start values, Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 9 and 12.

Claim 13 recites in part that “the check data block contains a set of error correction data that is used both for error correction at the transponder and to determine whether the transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.” Applicants assert that the limitations of claim 13 are not taught or suggested by Walczak or Meier.

Claim 14 recites in part that the “transponders process the command data block only if evaluation of the check data block of the request signal indicates that the transponder belongs to the group of transponders that is identified by the check data block.” Applicants assert that the limitations of claim 14 are not taught or suggested by the Walczak or Meier.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claims, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: April 29, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111